

Re: Potential narrative for distribution to TL community 

Elizabeth Allen to: Sheila Fleming

Cc: Kay Morrison, Scott Downey

08/22/2011 07:07 AM

I view the fact sheet as having two functions: First, to note that we feel that any exposure investigation can't be viewed as accurate or complete unless environmental sampling is done during application, and during the time frame closely following application. Bio-monitoring should be completed immediately post-application as well as some determined time interval following application. Second, that we intend to conduct such sampling regardless of whether or not PARC is involved.

Sheila Fleming

What started us down this path is that the state's...

08/22/2011 06:52:46 AM

From: Sheila Fleming/R10/USEPA/US
To: Elizabeth Allen/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Kay Morrison/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Scott Downey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 08/22/2011 06:52 AM
Subject: Re: Potential narrative for distribution to TL community

What started us down this path is that the state's plan will end if two pre-spray events don't show anything above health-based criteria in urine, drinking water or vegetation. We (EPA and ATSDR) believe that post-spray sampling (including air sampling) is essential. I think it is ok to say that we are supporting PARC, but plan to do more, with or without them. If OHA's sampling shows concentrations above health-based criteria then they plan to continue with additional pre- and post-spray sampling (including air), which we would continue to support.

I don't think it will be confusing for the public to see a separate fact sheet from the feds, do you?
S-

Sheila Fleming, P.E., Manager
Risk Evaluation Unit
Office of Environmental Assessment
US EPA Region 10, 1200 Sixth Avenue, Suite 900, Seattle, WA 98101
Office 206-553-1417
Cell (b) (6)
fleming.sheila@epa.gov

Elizabeth Allen

I'm going to posit that the purpose is a bit strong...

08/19/2011 06:30:19 PM